```
1
 2
 3
 4
 5
 6
 7
                   IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
 8
                        FOR THE DISTRICT OF OREGON
 9
10
   CASCADE GENERAL, INC.,
                                        No.
                                             05-1334-HU
11
                   Plaintiff,
12
         v.
                                              ORDER
13
14
   POWERHOUSE DIESEL SERVICES,
    INC.,
15
                   Defendant.
16
17
   Jill Schneider
   Schwabe, Williamson & Wyatt
18
   1211 S.W. Fifth Avenue, Suite 1900
   Portland, Oregon 97204
19
         Attorney for plaintiff
20
   Robert L. Aldisert
   Cody M. Weston
21
   Perkins Coie
    1120 N.W. Couch Street, Tenth Floor
22
   Portland, Oregon 97209
         Attorneys for defendant
23
24
   HUBEL, Magistrate Judge:
25
         Plaintiff Cascade General, Inc. (Cascade) moves the court for
26
   an award of attorney's fees to be deducted from the judgment. The
27
28
   ORDER Page 1
```

Case 3:05-cv-01334-HU Document 136 Filed 04/28/08 Page 1 of 3

motion is denied. Cascade's attorney's fees for the time spent preparing for trial a second time due to Powerhouse's request to postpone the trial shall be submitted as part of Cascade's request for its attorney's fees claimed as a prevailing party on its breach of contract claims.

The court has entered judgment on the parties' respective breach of contract claims. Both parties are entitled to attorney's fees on breach of contract claims. Prior to the commencement of trial, on May 15, 2006, defendant Powerhouse made an oral motion for a continuance because one of its key employee witnesses resigned and moved out of the United States precipitously. I granted the continuance over the objection of Cascade but entered an order that Cascade would be awarded fees reasonably incurred for having to prepare for trial twice (doc. # 86). Cascade prevailed in part on its breach of contract claim and is thus entitled to its reasonable prevailing party attorney's fees. This will include, no doubt, Cascade's fees for preparing for trial twice. Review of that portion of the fees is best done together with the rest of Cascade's fee petition, in context. Cascade is not entitled to these duplicated trial preparation fees twice, once as prevailing party and again as a sanction, if you will, for Powerhouse's request for continuance. The request for continuance granted by the court made it certain Cascade would get the costs of preparing for trial a second time regardless of whether it prevailed on its breach of contract claim.

Plaintiff's Motion to Reduce Powerhouse's Judgment (doc. #

28 0

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

Case 3:05-cv-01334-HU Document 136 Filed 04/28/08 Page 3 of 3